R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 018 CG 001 692

PSYCHOLOGY IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM.
BY- HERBERT, JOHN WILLIAMS, DONALD
REED COLL., PORTLAND, OREG.
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.84 19P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, TEACHER ATTITUDES, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *COURSE CONTENT, *COURSE OBJECTIVES, COURSE ORGANIZATION, COLLEGE STUDENTS, QUESTIONNAIRES,

SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN THE FORM AND SUBSTANCE OF PSYCHOLOGY OFFERINGS IN TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS MAY BE IMMINENT. ALTHOUGH THERE SEEMS TO BE SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT THAT PSYCHOLOGY SHOULD BE TAUGHT, AGREEMENT THAT CHANGES MUST BE MADE IS GENERAL. COURSE OBJECTIVES FORMULATED BY THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS PLANNING GROUP ARE LISTED. IT IS GENERALLY AGREED THAT THE DIRECTION OF THE CHANGE SHOULD BE TOWARDS A MORE APPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AS A FIELD OF INQUIRY AND THE STUDY OF PSYCHOLOGY AS A PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR TEACHERS. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS INCLUDE--(1) TEACHING ONLY THE MOST ESSENTIAL AND USEFUL THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS, (2) USING VARIOUS INSTRUCTORS WHO WOULD TEACH THE THEORY AND APPLICATIONS OF THEIR SPECIALIZATIONS, (3) USING A DUAL APPROACH, INCLUDING BOTH A THEORETICAL AND AN ANALYTICAL APPLIED COURSE, AND (4) A CORE PSYCHOLOGY COURSE AND SATELLITE COURSES EMPHASIZING THE APPLICATION OF MATERIALS TO TEACHING. MAJOR PROBLEMS INCLUDE THE DEFINITION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE THEORETICAL AND THE APPLIED COURSE, AND THE SCARCITY OF GENERALLY AVAILABLE MATERIALS FOR THE APPLIED COURSE. (PS)

ED017018

PSYCHOLOGY IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM*

John Herbert,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Donald Williams
University of Washington.

Should prospective teachers have to study psychology? What psychological knowledge does a teacher need? There are likely to be as many different answers to these questions as there are respondents. To the apprentice teacher who dislikes mathematics but is required to take a statistically oriented course in educational psychology, for example, the torture he undergoes seems futile, and nothing the instructor says or does will ever influence his teaching. To the instructor, on the other hand, no subject is more relevant to teaching, for he is certain that current research in his field is producing important results which will revolutionize education.

At present almost everyone who wishes to teach in public elementary and secondary schools is required by college faculties as well as by certification laws to take some courses in psychology. Prospective teachers probably constitute by far the largest group of students enrolled in psychology courses. But what psychology, if any, really ought to be offered in teacher preparation programs, and how much? These questions have been raised by educationists, psychologists, and some of the livelier students, and lately they have been explored by a number of college and university departments and by a state-wide psychological foundations study group in Oregon. The difficulty of finding a widely acceptable answer may be gauged by the fact that in 1965 a committee of seven distinguished psychologists, appointed by Division Fifteen of the American Psychological Association and working with psychologists across the nation, found that "a detailed specification of the content of educational psychology was a task that was neither appropriate nor possible within the limits of this project." [1]

It would be presumptuous to attemp such a task here.[2] In view of the openness and importance of the question, however, it seems appropriate now to state the issues which seem to be emerging and to call for further discussion. This paper, then, is an attempt to sample the range of opinion, with emphasis on material which is not readily accessible in published form; to report some

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

---

1 Committee to Study the Improvement of Teaching Educational Psychology, R. Stewart Jones, chairman, Handbook for Instructors of Educational Psychology (Champaigne, University of Illinois, 1965), p.4. The other members of the committee were: Gabriel Della-Piana, Philip Jackson, Bert. Y. Kersh, Herbert Klausemeier, Aileen Schoeppe, M.C. Wittrock.

2 For a summary of the topics included in educational psychology textbooks, see Derek N. Nunney, "Trends in the Content of Educational Psychology, 1948-63", Journal of Teacher Education, XV (December, 1964), 371-377.

* This paper was prepared as part of a study undertaken at the request of Reed College and partly financed by the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education & Welfare.

CG 001 692

solutions which have been proposed; to stimulate more thorough collection of information and opinion; and, finally, to suggest some directions which might usefully be followed in planning psychology courses for teachers.

The Range of Opinions

First, of course, there is the question whether psychology has any place at all in teacher education. Some would deny it. Francis Keppel gives this description of their view:

> The efforts to use scientific methods to study human behavior seem to them ridiculous if not impious. The result, they say, is a ponderous, pseudo-scientific language which takes ten pages to explain the obvious or to dilute the wisdom long ago learned in humanistic studies. They would argue that a few pages of Bacon or Montaigne are worth more than a three-volume psychological treatise, To build an art of teaching on the basis of the "behavioral sciences", they suggest, is to build on sand.[1]

The position Keppel described seems usually to be confined to those who are not themselves responsible for the professional preparation of teachers. Even among those directly concerned with teacher education, there are some, including psychologists, who appear to maintain that teachers ought not to be required to take psychology courses. Examination of their positions, however, usually reveals that instead they favor changes in the form and content of offerings to make them more meaningful and useful to teachers. In private conversations at such institutions as the University of Chicago, Columbia and Stanford Universities, and the University of Toronto, several psychologists expressed the opinion that psychology courses as they are currently taught are useless or even harmful to the work of teachers. One eminent psychologist said that educational psychology courses offered at present are "baroque and arcane".[2] In the words of another educational and clinical psychologist, they are potentially dangerous because "unless the beginning teacher has help in group management problems . . . the focus on the individual child may well be some barrier rather than a help.[3] The doubts of these psychologists (and of other psychologists and teacher educators) were not based on doubts about the potential importance to teachers of the behavioral sciences generally or of educational psychology in particular. All responded with interest to the question and offered suggestions about what could usefully be taught to teachers. Their views will be presented later in this paper.

Among those who do consider psychology to be actually or potentially valuable to teachers are the large number of advisory bodies who assist in the setting up of certification requirements and of university and college programs

---

[1] Francis Keppel, "The Education of Teachers", in Talks on American Education, ed. by Henry Chauncey (New York: Teachers College Press, 1962), p.91

[2] Matthew Miles, private conversation at Teachers College, April, 1967.

[1] Jacob S. Kounin, letter to author, June, 1967.

for teachers. Although at one time there was widespread criticism of these requirements, closer examination has tended to confirm the need to retain them. Conant was at first skeptical but came to accept the necessity of some work in psychology, at least for elementary school teachers:

> I have been convinced, largely by the testimony of students and teachers, that for those who teach children, psychology has much to say that is so valuable as to warrant the label "necessary", at least for elementary teachers. I believe that research will continue that will yeild generalizations sufficiently wide as to be called scientific. As an introduction to the point of view of those concerned with the behavior of animals (including man), a general course in psychology would seem essential.[1]

Support for the inclusion of psychology in the teacher training program also recently came from B.F. Skinner, who comments: "Teachers ... need the kind of help offered by a scientific analysis of behavior. Fortunately such an analysis is now available." [2] Herbert F. LaGrone, Director of Teacher Education and Media for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, also sees utility in psychology as part of the curriculum for teacher trainees. LaGrone advocates building a new series of five course ("Analytical Study of Teaching", "Structure and Uses of Knowledge", "Concepts of Human Learning and Development", "Designs for Teaching-Learning", and "Demonstration and Evaluation of Teaching Competencies"). Each of these has a psychological component. [3] Similarly, those who are concerned with the preparation of teachers of a particular discipline in the secondary schools see psychology as a necessary part of that preparation. The Commission on English, for example, recommends that "study in pedagogical processes include... one course in the psychology of learning".[4]

Questionnaire Results

A substantial number of experienced and student teachers seem to agree that psychology has an important place in teacher preparation, though what little specific information is available suggests that there may be very great diversity of opinion about what aspects of psychology and what kinds of instruction in psychology are useful or interesting. In a recent survey conducted by the National Education Association, about seven out of every ten teachers responding (92.7% of the sample responded) were satisfied with the contribution

---

[1] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p.136.

[2] B.F. Skinner, "Why Teachers Fail", Saturday Review of Literature, October 16, 1965, pp. 80-1, 98-102.

[3] Herbert LaGrone, A Proposal for the Revision of the Pre-Service Professional Component of a Program of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964), pp. 16-58.

[4] Commission on English, Report of the Commission, "The Quality of Instruction in English", in Freedom and Discipline in English (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), p.11.

that psychology courses had made to their success in teaching (see Figure 1).[1] Results given in the published report of the survey are restricted to undergraduate preparation and the data cannot be analyzed to distinguish teachers with particular graduate degrees. However, when the responses of the 547 teachers with Masters degrees or more were compared with those of the 1632 teachers with Bachelor degrees or less, the percentage of responses was almost identical, suggesting a very similar attitude towards the psychology courses.[2] The survey is repeated and published at five year intervals, and the figures given below confirm earlier findings.

Figure 1

Evaluation of Teacher Preparation

Question: In terms of actual contribution to your success in teaching, how would you evaluate the amount and quality of your undergraduate teacher preparation program in the following areas?

	Amount		Quality		
All Teachers Reporting (n=2,344)	Too Little	About right	Quality excellent	Quality satisfactory	No preparation or quality poor
Psychology of Learning & Teaching	22.1%	68.5	15	68	13.2
Human Growth & Development[3]	19.5%	72.7	15.9	66.5	13.3

Cornell & Stanford Universities

Information about the views of experienced teachers who have completed fifth-year programs is difficult to obtain. A number of programs follow up their students, but their graduates are scattered and the rate of response is generally low. Thus, for example, Cornell University, in its survey of 105 graduates who earned the M.Ed. degree between 1954 and 1959,[4] received only 76 replies. Stanford University has consistently attempted to obtain information about the graduates of its MAT-type program. A carefully designed questionnaire has been sent out each year to all graduates of the program from 1960 when the first group

---

1 "Professional Preparation for Teaching", in The American Public-School Teacher, 1965-66, Research Report 1967 - R4, prepared by Hazel Davis, Special consultant (Washignton, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967), p.10.

2 For another recent report of this nature see Sherman Frey and Joseph Ellis, "Psychology and Teaching: Opinions of Experienced Teachers", The Teachers College Journal, XXXVIII (December, 1966), pp. 88-91.

3 Additional information supplied by Dr. Simeon P. Taylor, Assistant Director, Research Division, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

4 Kenneth R. Stow, "A Study of the Masters of Education Programs at Cornell University", (unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1960). (Typewritten).

of twenty-five students completed the course through last year when over 100 students were graduated. Last year, in spite of considerable effort to ensure returns, only about 20% of the 400 alumni of the program completed the form. Reed has experienced similar difficulties in obtaining responses to a questionnaire which was sent out this summer. However, after some effort, 108 completed questionnaires were secured from the 115 students who graduated from the MAT program over the last five years.

Even when the rate of response is low, however, the results of these surveys are interesting. It seems significant that although Philosophy of Education was by far the most popular course among graduates of Cornell's Master of Education programs (50.5% reported to have liked this course best), Educational Psychology was rated the most important course (82.6% thought it should be mandatory and 71.1% thought the course in Educational Measurement and Testing should be mandatory, while 66.6% felt that Philosophy of Education should be required). Results of the annual Stanford survey have not been reported, but another study which was written up for use by Stanford instructors and staff members gives some information about the reactions of students to certain activities in the educational psychology course.[1]

In May 1967 a questionnaire was given to intern teachers at the end of their second quarter at Stanford, and all but five of the 125 students responded. Although no direct question was asked about the usefulness of psychology to teachers, there were some questions about specific aspects of the course. The results are too detailed to be reproduced here, but it seems worthwhile to summarize responses to some of the questions.

The following activities are examples of those found useless by more students than found them useful: the writing of a paper on adolescents, formulation of instructional strategies, study of taxonomies, and participation as subjects in educational experiments. Aspects of the course which the majority of students found useful were: the writing of programs, formulating of behavioral objectives for a unit and a nine to twelve week course, the planning of student evaluation, and "micro teaching", the teaching of small groups of students under close supervision, intended to train new teachers in a particular teaching skill, such as the use of silence or the encouraging of student participation in classroom discussions.

There was no topic or activity in educational psychology that some group of students at Stanford did not find useful or interesting. Although the majority of students responding recommended limiting lectures in educational psychology to a single summer term, most of the students found a substantial portion of the applied part of the work both useful and interesting.

Reed College

At Reed, by means of the questionnaire already referred to, we recently surveyed the opinions of our MAT graduates about the contribution they believed

---

[1] Intern Advisory Committee, School of Education, "Report to Secondary Education Committee", Stanford, California, Stanford University, May 22, 1967. (Dittoed).

psychology courses had made to their teaching. Some background information may be needed to interpret results. Reed MAT students, like those at Cornell & Stanford, are typically very successful liberal arts graduates who have taken few if any undergraduate courses in psychology or education. Before 1962 the Reed program required or offered very little work in psychology - only a brief portion of a course in the Foundations of Public School Teaching. Offerings in psychology were increased, partly because of certification requirements but partly also at the request of the teaching interns, until by 1964 students normally took two courses in psychology.

Four questions in the survey related to the students' opinions about the value of psychology courses. The results have not yetbeen fully analyzed, but some of the main trends are clear. Question 13 asked: "Have you found anything you learned in the psychology courses at Reed helpful in your teaching?" Of the students in the program during the two years from 1962-64, only a few more responded favorably than unfavorably, and in the year 1964-65 the negative replies exceeded the positive ones. Taking the three years together, fewer than 50% of the students found the courses helpful. But in 1965-66 the number of students who believed that the courses were useful in their teaching jumped to 85% and in 1966-67 the figure remained relatively high at 71%. A similar dramatic reversal occurred in the responses to Question 15: "Did you find the courses useful for purposes other than classroom teaching?" During the two years, 1962-64, students on the whole did not find them useful, by a narrow but definite margin. From 1965-1967, however, three to four times as many students found the courses useful for purposes other than classroom teaching. Answers to Question 16 were more consistent" "Did any of the courses contribute to your general education?" Affirmative answers were given by a substantial majority of the students each year, but even here there was a considerable increase over the last three years. Answers to Question 14 also shifted, but in a somewhat different way. During the first three years more students answered affirmatively than negatively to the question: "Have you found any aspects of psychology that were not covered in the psychology courses at Reed that would have been helpful in your teaching?" During the last two years, however, answers were more evenly divided. This suggests that, as the work in psychology became more relevant to teaching, students felt less need for additional areas to be added to the psychology courses, at least to be of help to their teaching.

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO REED MAT GRADUATES, SUMMER 1967.

Question 13: Have you found anything you learned in the psychology courses at Reed helpful in your teaching? When and how?
The nos. in parentheses are the % of the total no. of those who returned questionnaires.

Year	No. of graduates	No. of questionnaires returned	Yes	No	Non-commital	No response
1962-3	17	17	8 (47%)	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)
1963-4	23	22	9 (41%)	7 (32%)	4 (18%)	2 (9%)
1964-5	21	18	6 (33%)	9 (50%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)
1965-6	28	27	23 (85%)	4 (15%)	---	---
1966-7	26	24	17 (71%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
TOTALS	115	108	63 (58%)	30 (28%)	10 (9%)	5 (5%)

Question 14: Have you found any aspects of psychology that were not covered in the psychology courses at Reed that would have been helpful in your teaching?

Year	No. of graduates	No. of questionnaires returned	Needed additional psych. courses	Reed courses sufficient	Non-commital	No response
1962-3	17	17	8 (47%)	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	2 (12%)
1963-4	23	22	9 (41%)	2 (9%)	6 (27%)	5 (23%)
1964-5	21	18	12 (67%)	2 (11%)	---	4 (22%)
1965-6	28	27	13 (48%)	11 (41%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
1966-7	26	24	8 (33%)	10 (42%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)
TOTALS	115	108	50 (46%)	28 (26%)	14 (13%)	16 (15%)

Question 15: Did you find the courses useful for purposes other than classroom teaching, getting a job, or certification? Yes___ No___. Which courses were useful and how?

Year	No. of graduates	No. of questionnaires returned	Yes	No	Non-commital	No response
1962-3	17	17	7 (41%)	8 (47%)	---	2 (12%)
1963-4	23	22	5 (23%)	9 (41%)	2 (9%)	6 (27%)
1964-5	21	18	11 (61%)	4 (22%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)
1965-6	28	27	22 (81%)	5 (19%)	---	---
1966-7	26	24	18 (75%)	4 (17%)	---	2 (8%)
TOTALS	115	108	63 (58%)	30 (28%)	3 (3%)	12 (11%)

Question 16: Did any of the courses contribute to your general education? If so, how?

Year	No. of graduates	No. of questionnaires returned	Yes	No	Non-commital	No response
1962-3	17	17	9 (53%)	3 (18%)	3 (18%)	2 (12%)
1963-4	23	22	12 (55%)	4 (18%)	1 (5%)	5 (23%)
1964-5	21	18	13 (72%)	2 (11%)	---	3 (17%)
1965-6	28	27	24 (89%)	2 (7%)	---	1 (4%)
1966-7	26	24	20 (83%)	2 (8%)	---	2 (8%)
TOTALS	115	108	78 (72%)	13 (12%)	4 (4%)	13 (12%)

The results, then, show clearly that while in all years a reasonably large number of students found psychology contributed to their teaching, to other aspects of their work, and to their general education, the feeling was much stronger among students who participated in the program during the last two or three years. Each of the questions called for qualitative answers which have not yet been analyzed but which, it is hoped, will throw light on the reasons for the changes in attitude. Even now, however, it is possible to speculate that since, during the five years covered by the survey, there were no changes in the nature of the student body or in the manner of selecting students, and since changes in staffing were continuous over the whole period, deliberate attempts at changing the courses themselves resulted in changes in the students' reactions. From 1965 on, instructors sought to provide interns with experiences which simulated some important teaching functions and enabled them to use and examine applications of psychology to their own work.

Course Content and Objectives

Assuming then, that psychology has a part to play in teacher preparation programs, the question remains what should be taught, how and when. Educational psychologists usually respond to this question by asking for the objective to be achieved by the teaching. Recently a group of psychologists[1] after a series of conferences reached the conclusion that courses in psychology in teacher preparation programs ought to aim at the following outcomes. They should:

1. enable teachers to obtain orderly information about the classroom processes, using the disciplined resources of psychology;

---

1 Psychological Foundations Planning Group, sponsored by the Oregon State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon, under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. enable teachers to take a new look at classroom events, formulate hypotheses about students and learning and test them to arrive at professional decisions;

3. enable the instructors to screen out from teaching, students incapable of reaching professional decisions;

4. help students to feel positively oriented towards psychological knowledge and skills, so that they will continue to apply them and to learn about them;

5. enable teachers to assume the role of the teacher expected by administrators, parents, fellow teachers, understanding the terms and having the knowledge commonly commanded by professionals;

6. provide the teacher with techniques for handling individual students and groups of students, with ways of shaping their behavior, and with knowledge of how students go about shaping the teacher's behavior;

7. sensitize the teacher to his own and his students' feelings, for example those of hostility, insecurity, altruism, and helpfulness, and to the ways of considering them in the classroom.

This list of objectives cannot, of course, be taken to represent the views of educational psychologists generally, or even of those who attended the meetings in Oregon, since each item was of primary importance to only some of the participants. For example, Professor Richard Ripple of Cornell University, who was present as a consultant, considered only the first two objectives to be critical and regarded all the others as definitely secondary. In describing the objectives of the course he teaches at Cornell, Professor Ripple writes:

> The psychological foundations can be said to be relevant in two general, but distinct, ways. First, educational psychology, as a body of information, can help in the generation of hypotheses ...A second contribution made by educational psychology is that of helping teachers acquire the attitudes and skills necessary to intelligent hypothesizing and the testing of hypotheses. This involves, for example, such skills as how to interpret data intelligently, how to observe accurately, how to avoid fallacies in making unwarranted inferences, how to made adequate decisions regarding what data should be gathered, ways in which data can be gathered and used, etc.[1]

This position is distinctly that of the research-oriented psychologist. It aims at making the teacher a scientist who looks for problems and answers objectively and rigorously.

---

[1] Richard E. Ripple, "Education 511: Educational Psychology". Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1967. (Mimeographed)

In contrast, Professor Philip Jackson starts not from the definition of educational psychology as a field of inquiry, but from the description of the job of the teacher as it really is. "When students are in front of him, and the fat is in the fire", Jackson writes, "the teacher tends to do what he feels or knows is right rather than with what he thinks is right". Of course thought is involved, but "it is thought of quite a different order from which occurs in an empty classroom".[1]

Psychological theory enters minimally into a teacher's thinking while he is facing his class, according to Jackson (private conversation, April, 1967), but it can assist him in preparing lessons before the students arrive (for example, considering in advance what to do about Billy who has to go to the toilet all the time) and in evaluating students' performances after they leave the classroom. During these periods, Jackson has said, teaching assumes the appearance of a "highly rational process" in which the teacher uses psychology as one source of information and technique. We need a separate psychology for each of the two kinds of thinking that teachers do.

During the pre-active and post-active periods, according to Jackson, teachers may make decisions and may establish and examine hypotheses. What is taught in the usual educational psychology course is relevant here. It is also relevant for another part of the teacher's work, the need to establish himself in the role of teacher and face his public - command the vocabulary of psychology and display the knowledge expected of him. During the period of actual teaching, however, the teacher faces a "social maelstrom" to which the contents of courses and textbooks are irrelevant. He has to hobble along with some advice from the therapists until the social psychologists have more to offer.

Therapists such as Carl Rogers have still another view of the work of the teacher. His task is to be "a facilitator of significant learning", to help students (including prospective teachers) learn what they find rewarding, discover what has meaning in their present experiences. This comes from facing real problems, involving others in problems real to them, accepting with empathy other people's concerns, becoming sensitive to them.[2] Psychology courses, or better, psychological experiences provided in the teacher preparation program, should not only help teachers to acquire these characteristics but should also exemplify them.

---

[1] Philip Jackson, "The Way Teaching Is", in The Way Teaching Is, ed. by Mrs. Curtice Hitchcock (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development & the National Education Association, 1966), p.13.

[2] Carl Rogers, "What Psychology Has to Offer Teacher Education" (mimeographed paper prepared for Conference on Educational Foundations, Cornell University, April 27-28, 1964).

Social psychologists have something of the same orientation, but with more emphasis on inter-group relationships. Thus Professor Matthew Miles of Teachers College, Columbia University, considers the problem to be not that of providing courses for teachers, but of providing experiences - for example, sensitivity training and the use of observation techniques, interaction recording systems and audio and video tapes to obtain information about their own teaching. Further, teachers should be familiar with various ways of shaping behavior and with techniques which produce changes in people's attitudes and conduct. According to Miles, traditional textbooks and courses - for example, work on learning - are useless in helping teachers to learn to teach or to improve teaching.[1]

Some psychologists, for example Professor Jacob Kounin in the letter cited above, feel even more strongly that help in group management must precede or accompany any work in psychology. Their feeling is supported by the frequency with which student teachers ask for more help in their relationships with their pupils, especially in dealing with discipline problems.

In spite of great diversity of opinion, psychologists, educationists, administrators, teachers, and student teachers appear to identify the difficulties in a similar way, stressing the need for a more appropriate relationship between the academic study of educational psychology as a field of inquiry and the professional study of psychology in the preparation of classroom teachers.[2] Virtually every psychologist whose views were sought, including some not quoted here, expressed strong faith in the potential efficacy of psychological knowledge and skill to make a contribution to the performance of teachers,[3] but everyone either expressed strong doubts about the adequacy of the standard lecture course as a means to that end or else totally condemned the traditional course offerings.

When Philip Jackson, Jacob Kounin, and Matthew Miles talk about the kind of training that would be helpful to teachers, they have in mind a series of experiences which would enable teachers to understand better how and why people, primarily themselves and students but also parents and administrators, respond to others. They do not mean a series of talks or even demonstrations or discussions, but a set of carefully planned activities involving the student teacher directly in the use and evaluation of psychological knowledge. Ripple also recognizes the need for classroom applications, though he would prefer to consider this the field of the colleague responsible for teaching methods while the professor of educational psychology teaches teachers to invent and test psychological hypotheses.

---

[1] Private conversation at Teachers College, April, 1967.

[2] For a similar position in the United Kingdom, see Committee on Higher Education, Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-3 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), Vol. 1, p.107.

[3] This is a change from the past - see, for example James, Symonds, Goodwin Watson etc.

Professor Frederick J. McDonald of Stanford University, on the other hand, would welcome the opportunity to teach the applications as well as the theory of particular units of psychology, partly because of the greater psychological efficacy of this combination and partly because of the opportunity to obtain feedback from students for research purposes.[1]

We do not have the data to make inferences about the kind of work in psychology that Conant, the Commission on English, the students at Cornell, or the teachers surveyed by the NEA would like to have offered to teachers. We do know, however, that LaGrone, the fifth-year students at Stanford, and the teachers who had received the Reed MAT degree responded favorably to those parts of the program which bore most directly on teaching.

Recognizing then, the need to teach the classroom applications of psychological theory in new ways, one must also recognize a serious obstacle in the way of improvement. Teaching by providing experiences, whether they are of group interaction, of classroom events, of evaluative techniques, or of shaping student behavior or other aspects of psychology, is very demanding of staff and time. It certainly cannot be done satisfactorily in a course which at the same time attempts to give an organized survey of the total field of educational psychology, the sources of knowledge, and the techniques of research.

Possible Solution

One solution might be to select from the field only the most essential, useful aspects and teach those both theoretically and practically. Thus one might select testing and measurement or developmental psychology or learning or group interaction, depending on the preferences of the department or the instructor. This selective emphasis, however, would leave untouched most of the potential contributions of psychology to teaching and so leave the student in ignorance of many resources which are available to him.

A second possible solution is the one which was proposed but eventually rejected at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.[2] Each student was to have the right to choose one behavioral science (for example, anthropology, sociology, or psychology) for study in depth, taking several courses in the field, in the expectation that this would enable him to bring the resources of that discipline to bear on his teaching and to examine his teaching in an organized manner. One may well wonder, however, whether the ability to make

---

[1] Private conversation at Stanford, July, 1967.

[2] Frank Peters, "Considerations Leading to a New Program in Education for Students Who Plan to Teach", Stony Brook, N.Y., State University of New York, Dec., 1965. (Mimeographed).

independent professional applications would necessarily result from the academic study of any discipline, and, equally seriously, one may maintain that psychology has a contribution to make to teaching of which no prospective teacher should be deprived.

A third suggestion made in conversation by Professor McDonald, would substitute for the lecture course given by one instructor, a course in which a number of instructors would first lecture on their own specialties and then work through the applications of the topic discussed, using classroom experiences and research as needed.[1] Though this might be an ideal solution, it is administratively difficult to achieve. Even a university of the distinction of Stanford might have difficulty in coordinating and staffing a course of this type. Other institutions, especially smaller ones, are not likely to have enough staff members both expert in an area of psychology and knowledgeable about classroom teaching.

Programs for teacher education may well want to experiment with a dual approach, offering instead of the traditional subject oriented courses called Testing & Measurement, Child Development, Guidance and so on, two function oriented courses. One would be a theoretical course, aimed at achieving the first four objectives identified by the Oregon Committee: the ordering of data, the use of the discipline of psychology, the formulation of hypotheses and the screening out of students incapable of making professional judgments. This course would also seek to enable teachers to assume the role of professional educator, versed in the language of psychology.

This course then could form the foundation of an analytic-applied course, aimed at the other three objectives of the Oregon Committee: to help teachers feel that psychology is helpful to them in their contact with students and in classroom decisions, to sensitize the teacher to his own and his students' feelings, and (together with the methods courses and the practical experience) to provide the insight necessary to fuse the daily teaching experience into an intellectually integrated whole.

The theoretical course might well resemble some parts of currently offered courses, using materials, tests and ideas such as those which are usefully described in the Handbook for Instructors of Educational Psychology or some of the more recent textbooks. Laboratory tasks would be related to this course, as they are now in many of the more effective programs. Students, aware that direct classroom applications would be developed in the applied-analytic course, could use their academic skills without the defensive reaction which comes when professional preparation is expected within an academic teaching format.

---

1 Frederick J. McDonald, private conversation, July, 1967.

Professor A.W. Foshay, of Teachers College, Columbia University forsees a possible further development:

> We could think in terms of satellite courses, around a core psychology course. The core course would be taught by a psychologist and would contain psychological theories, research, etc. The satellite courses would be designed to help teachers apply the materials, and would be taught by professionals who were specially capable in assisting teachers to apply the psychological knowledge to their work.
>
> The intention then would be to prepare teachers who practiced the profession of pedagogy. They would be trained, partly through practice, to see the reasons behind the way teachers teach, even when the experienced teachers themselves do not know. They would cease to see teaching as a bag of tricks. When experienced teachers suggest to them that it is important to start lessons definitely, they would be aware of the psychological reasons.[I]

Development Needed

At present there are substantial difficulties facing the establishment of such a cluster of courses. One is the problem of working out the exact relationship between the theoretical and applied courses, and in particular, the relationship of the instructors to one another and to the students. Perhaps progress along those lines is more likely to occur in the smaller colleges where classes are smaller, the possibility of experimenting with different course structures and faculty relationship is greater, and the problem of providing laboratory experiences in the schools is less overwhelming.

An equally serious problem is the scarcity of generally available materials for the applied work. Unlike the instructors of the theoretical, experimental or educational psychology courses, the faculty member attempting an analytic-applied course has to improvise his own movies, tapes, cases and even tests, a time-consuming, wasteful and unreliable process. There is a great need for help for teachers of applied courses. The answer to this need potentially could come from a sharing of resources among colleges, school districts, and research institutes, to develop viable applied-analytic courses for instructors to adopt and adapt. However, leadership could hardly be expected from school districts or small colleges, which are unlikely to have the resources. It is ultimately the responsibility of large universities and research institutes. Courses need to be planned, outlined and developed; materials created, tried out and evaluated -- an opportunity for professors of psychology and curriculum departments to work with teacher educators in an effective formulation of a program to help teachers in their increasingly complex task.

[I] Paraphrased, private conversation with Professor Foshay, Teachers College, April, 1967.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The American Public School Teacher, 1965-6. Research Report 1967-R4. Prepared by Hazel Davis, special consultant. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967.

Ausubel, David P. Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View, in Press.

Bigge, Morris L., and Hunt, Maurice P. Psychological Foundations of Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Blair, Glenn M., Jones, R.S.; and Simpson, Ray S. Educational Psychology. Second Edition. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Carpenter, Finley, and Haddan, Eugene. Systematic Applications of Psychology to Education. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Commission on English. Freedom and Discipline in English. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

Committee to Study the Improvement of Teaching Educational Psychology. R. Steward Jones, chairman. Handbook for Instructors of Educational Psychology. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1965.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Cronbach, Lee J. Educational Psychology. 2nd edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Crow, Lester D. and Alice. Educational Psychology. New revised edition. New York: American Book Company, 1963.

Doll, R.C. Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1964.

Frandsen, Arden N. Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Frey, Sherman, and Ellis, Joseph. "Psychology and Teaching: Opinions of Experienced Teachers." The Teachers College Journal, XXXVIII (December, 1966), 88-91.

Intern Advisory Committee, School of Education, Stanford University. "Report to the Secondary Education Committee", Stanford, May 22, 1967. (Dittoed.)

Jackson, Philip. "The Way Teaching Is". The Way Teaching Is. Edited by Mrs. Curtice Hitchcock. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervisior and Curriculum Development and the National Education Association, 1966.

James, William. Talks to Teachers on Psychology. New York: H. Holt and Company, 901.

Keppel, Francis, "The Education of Teachers." Talks on American Education. Edited by Henry Chauncey. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Klausmeier, Herbert J., and Goodwin, William. Learning and Human Abilities: Educational Psychology. 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Bros., 1966.

Kolesnik, Walter B. Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

LaGrone, Herbert F. A Proposal for the Revision of the Pre-Service Professional Component of a Program of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964.

Lindgren, Henry C. Educational Psychology in the Classroom. 3rd edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

McDonald, Frederick J. Educational Psychology. 2nd edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1965.

Morse, William C., and Wingo, G. Max. Psychology and Teaching. 2nd edition. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1962.

Mouly, George J. Psychology for Effective Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Nunney, Derek N. "Trends in the Content of Educational Psychology, 1948-63." Journal of Teacher Education, XV (December, 1964) pp. 372-377.

Olsen, Willard C. Psychological Foundations of the Curriculum. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1957.

Peters, Frank R. "Considerations Leading to a New Program in Education for Students Who Plan to Teach." State University of New York at Stony Brook, December, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

Pressey, Sidney L.; Robinson, Francis P.; and Horrocks, John E. Psychology in Education. New York: Harper and Row., 1959.

Psychological Foundations Planning Group. Sponsored by the Oregon State Department of Education under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Ripple, Richard E. "Education 511: Educational Psychology", Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1967. (Mimeiographed.)

Rogers, Carl. "What Psychology Has to Offer Teacher Education." Paper prepared for the Conference on Educational Foundations, Cornell University, April 27-28, 1964. (Mimeographed.)

Rogers, Carl. Five Fields and Teacher Education. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Project One Publication, 1965.

Shoben, Edward J. "Psychology in the Training of Teachers." Teachers College Record, LXV, No. 5 (February, 1964), 436-440.

Skinner, B.F. "Why Teachers Fail." Saturday Review of Literature, XLVIII (October 16, 1965), 80-1, 98-102.

Skinner, B.F. The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Stephens, J.M. Educational Psychology: The Study of Educational Growth. Revised edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956.

Stephens, John M. The Psychology of Classroom Learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Stow, Kenneth R. "A Study of the Master of Education Programs at Cornell University." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1960. (Typewritten.)

Symonds, Percival M. What Education Has to Learn from Psychology. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

Thompson, George G.; Gardner, Eric F.; and DiVesta, Francis. Educational Psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Thyne, James M. The Psychology of Learning and Techniques of Teaching. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1963.

Trow, William C. Psychology in Teaching and Learning. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960.

Watson, Goodwyn. What Psychology Can We Trust? New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.